

# What has Christianity to say on Leisure in the Modern State?

By

T. M. HERON



THE INDUSTRIAL CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP  
THE LIBRARY

THE CATHEDRAL OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE

CATHEDRAL HEIGHTS

NEW YORK 25, N. Y. Sixpence



**Note.**

This is the substance of an address given in Southwark Cathedral on 20th May, 1949, in connection with the London Mission. It has been published by the I.C.F., with the consent of the author, for the benefit of those desirous of obtaining copies. It is hoped that it will have a wide circulation.

**P. T. R. KIRK,**

*General Director,  
Industrial Christian Fellowship.*

CANCELLED



# What has Christianity to say on Leisure in the Modern State?

By T. M. HERON.

I SHOULD like to begin by describing what I think we Christians ought to be calling the Modern Leisure Heresy. I think it runs something like this. We have discovered that by equipping ourselves with labour-saving machinery, and by organising production on a large scale, we can produce more things in less time than our forefathers were ever able to do. It is taken for granted that this in itself is a good thing, and it is assumed that if only we can go on learning how to produce more and more things in less and less time, then soon we shall all be living in a state of plenty, and have lots of free time, and that will be splendid. If to-day we are more often aware of austerity than of plenty the excuse given is that we are suffering from the destruction and dislocation caused by the war. And by many the inherent wickedness of the Russians, or of the Financiers, or of the Jews, is thought to make some postponement of the leisure age inevitable. But in the nature of things this is what leisure is now supposed to be—freedom from work and from the curse of work; time to enjoy the contents of the bigger and better barns, when we have built and stored them. And the general assumption is that if only we are sensible and good, we shall put up with the unpleasant tasks which a machine economy imposes, and find ourselves richly compensated for any loss of freedom in our work by having our leisure hours extended; the bargain is believed to be too good to be missed.

The Mediævals used to say that in all their daily work men ought to worship God. And even so late as the seventeenth century, George Herbert, in the hymn which we still sing, wrote that prayer makes a servant's drudgery divine, and that

“Who sweeps a room, as for thy laws  
Makes that and the action fine.”

If the exponent of the leisure heresy is reminded of this old attitude to work, he generally replies that sweeping a room is



one thing, but that working with modern machinery is quite another kettle of fish. He tells us to be realists, and to face up to the fact that monotonous soul destroying work really is a part of the price which we have to pay for efficient machine production, and that this being so the only sensible thing for us to do is to use the machine to reduce our hours of labour as much as possible. And if we say that some of our work with the machine, even with reduced hours of labour, takes something out of our natures, and leaves us less men than we were before, he tells us that remedial exercises outside working hours can put back into our systems what our machine work has taken out of them. And all the time the general benefits of a higher standard of living are stressed.

By and large I think that what I have just given you is a fair description of our modern heresy. I certainly hope that it is, for I do not want to tilt at a windmill. The strength of the heresy lies of course, in the fact that it makes the best of both worlds. It enables us to still our consciences about the worst effects of machine production, and then proceed without delay to the more congenial task of devising new and better ways of spending "the time when we are not working." And the fact that the Castle Howards and Blenheim Palaces, superb monuments of the eighteenth century leisure heresy, now confront us as the noble white elephants they always were, is not likely to deter us from thinking big or from planning large.

Let me say at once that even as I have been describing the Leisure Heresy I have been aware of the measure of truth which is contained in it; and this is as it should be, for a heresy is never just a tissue of falsehoods; it is rather an over-emphasis of certain truths to the neglect of others which are equally important.

Now the truths about work and leisure which are being over-emphasised to-day are important and must not be lost sight of. Let us see what they are. First of all, no sensible man wants to go the long way round about a job if he knows a short way which will produce equally good results. It is true of course, that short cuts are often deceptive, and further that many of the present day products of machine production do not really satisfy us as the best of the old hand-made goods undoubtedly did. Nevertheless the case for the machine as a labour-saver is, I think, unassailable. War, and the prepara-



tion for war, and faulty economic planning may have left us, as I said just now, with more signs of austerity than of plenty. But we are right nevertheless to congratulate ourselves that our machine techniques really do make possible a more widespread plenty of material wealth than ever before. And that is a good thing, provided of course that we do not forget that greater material wealth always brings in its train its own temptations.

Secondly, it is true that in some of our machine production there is a hard core of activity which must, in the very nature of things, be distasteful, and which, if we are men, we shall just accept as being all part of the day's work, and therefore something to be put up with as cheerfully as possible. But it is sheer nonsense to imagine that because this is a machine age the amount of drudgery that we must put up with is necessarily greater than it was when our technical knowledge was so very much less than it is to-day. If any of you are tempted to idealise the past, think of the back-breaking work of a row of hand-reapers having to keep up with the pace set by the strongest man in the team; or remember the months and months which the cabinet-makers' apprentice spent in rough planing before ever he was allowed to touch another tool. No! the machine age is a labour-saver.

What then is wrong with the prevalent modern theory? Simply this, I think, that, on one of the levels on which we live and work, the reward which one can justly look forward to for sticking an unpleasant task, is always and only to be found in the task itself, and in the sense of mastery which inevitably comes from the experience of a hard-won achievement. I do assure you that I am not making a fuss about nothing. To expect that drudgery in the sphere of activity we call work, will have as its reward an absence of drudgery in that other sphere of activity we call leisure, is the surest way there is of ruining both activities. The mediæval theory, *Laborare est Orare* (to labour is to pray) waged ceaseless war on drudgery; our modern theory merely tries to restrict it and accommodate it. And, be it remembered, we in this age are better equipped to wage war on drudgery than ever the mediævals were.

Our trouble is, I think, that because we have left religion out of account we have landed ourselves with two quite irrational concepts, the one of work, the other of something



which is merely not work, which we call leisure. Is a bored shop assistant, waiting for customers who do not come, really working? Is a university blue, rowing harder than galley slave ever rowed, not working? But accepting for the moment our popular concepts of work and leisure, is it not clear that as it is always a human person who carries over from the one activity into the other, any defect in a work activity is bound to affect a leisure activity adversely?

Unless we can get our work right we cannot possibly get our leisure right. If we have a bad conscience about our work or a feeling of grievance about it, any holiday which we take is bound to be but a temporary escape from work. All the time we are having our so-called holiday, the cloud of our work will be hanging over us. And under these circumstances we shall be tempted to force our holiday into a hectic and unnatural shape. Is not this the explanation of the fact that after so many holidays to-day people find it more difficult than ever to resume their every day occupations?

If our work does not satisfy us the place to remedy matters is in the work itself, not outside it. And if our mass production processes exert a de-naturalising and de-personalising influence upon us, then it is our mass production processes which we must alter. We have the means to do so. We must direct Industrial Psychologist, Plant Layout Expert, Production Manager and Inventor to help us to re-arrange our tasks so that it may be possible for our energy and endurance to be rewarded each time we see the result of our day's work. For it is only when we are able to do this with pride and satisfaction that we can possibly slide spontaneously into a leisure activity and enjoy it for its own sake. Creation invites and wins for itself recreation, and all creative activities lead naturally to religion. But drudgery, unless accepted as a penance, invites revolt and debauch. And drudgery cannot be appeased by higher wages and shorter hours.

Please bear in mind the distinction I am trying to make between hard work and drudgery. Hard work is something one *gives* because one realises that without it a purpose one approves of, cannot possibly be achieved. Drudgery on the other hand is work without its reason and purpose. It is something which a free man will only accept as a penance.



because he has lost his way, and whilst he is finding it again. Drudgery ought therefore never to be accepted as a permanent part of any work process. And yet this is just what we are being invited to do to-day and all in the name of "a higher standard of living," as if, living and working in a fallen state of man and society our plain duty was not always to eliminate all that is deadening, to save and redeem labour! That in fact is what many of our industrial leaders and workers at the bench are always trying to do, and increasingly they can show examples of genuine creative activity in highly mechanised factories. But all our efforts to use modern machinery creatively have to be made against a background of unbelief. For unless a man has already found that his work with the machine has satisfied him, the chances are that all that he will hope for is that it shall be endurable, and that the pay he will get for it will enable him to forget all about his work as soon as it is over. Moreover, many an apprentice to-day who is genuinely attracted by machinery, and who therefore gives himself wholeheartedly to the task of mastering the technique of machine production, is laughed at by the old hands, and told that his enthusiasm will soon wane; he may even be warned to "go slow" lest his example should lead to a general speeding-up of everyone else.

This attitude to machine production is of course very largely a legacy from the days of the Industrial Revolution, for then it was that so many of our present ideas of machine-tending began to be worked out, and then it was that our inventors and the business men who marshalled their machines were constantly being told by the economists that the main thing to be desired of labour was that it should be cheap. And cheap it was, for a pool of unemployment kept wages down and enabled labourers to be disciplined to accept as inevitable any work process which the machine owners cared to impose.

Now a heresy is not only wrong in theory. It is also wrong in practice; by which I mean that actions motivated by a heresy invariably fail to produce the results which were originally claimed for them. So if what I am now calling our Modern Leisure heresy really is a heresy, it follows that no matter how strenuously we act according to the dictates of its principles we never shall get the leisure which it promises. Let us look therefore at some of the results which are already



beginning to show themselves. Are there, indeed, encouraging signs that a rich and extended leisure will soon be enjoyed by everyone, or are there more signs of continued austerity, of strife and crisis and perhaps of widespread collapse? On the whole, is not our main feeling to-day one of frustration, that somehow or other new and unexpected obstacles are always presenting themselves, so that it is still a case of "jam yesterday, and jam to-morrow, but never jam to-day"?

The main evidence we have for our continuing belief in the practicability of a vast plenty to support an expanding leisure, is I think, the example of the American machine economy, for in its present stage of development American industry can hardly function unless somehow or other it endows the rest of the world with its surplus. To get a true picture of its enormous productivity, consider for a moment what happened during the war when the American industrial machine released millions of workers for the fighting Services. Not only was it able to equip them all, and to a large extent the allied armies too, and with the most expensive equipment that armies ever had. But whilst doing all this it was in addition enabling the material standard of living of the whole American people to be raised higher than ever before. And let us never forget that on top of it all, the Americans were giving to us and other nations vast supplies of food and clothing and other necessities of life. With this striking example of productivity before us, surely the practicability of material plenty cannot be dismissed as merely an idle dream.

If this is a true picture of the production which a machine economy can give, have we any grounds for believing that the problem of distribution has been solved? Our main support for a belief that the wealth produced by the machine can be shared out equitably is the example of our own growing Welfare State, a development which our present Government has merely speeded up. We in this country have, I think, now managed to secure a more widespread distribution of our national wealth, a fairer sharing out of the good things of life than any other economy has yet been able to achieve. And yet what do we find? Are we not more concerned to-day with the problem of labour incentives than we are with the questions as to how best we can spend our leisure?



Do we not find that as we try to give a more cultural education to more and more children, fewer of them as a result are willing to serve the machine whose production alone enables us to maintain our educational system? And do we not also find that in general as the standard of living of the masses rises, the inclination to put up with the discipline which efficient mass-production always requires, diminishes? A sense of the danger of the situation has so far kept us fairly free from industrial disputes. But do not most of us feel that we simply have not yet faced up to the question as to how the "dirty work" of the new world is to be done, and that until we have done so we cannot possibly feel that as a community we have earned our Leisure, and therefore that it really will be available for us? A totalitarian state can direct labour and impose discipline by the threat of relegation to a Labour Camp. But a Free Society, believing as we do in the Leisure Heresy, and at our present stage of our machine development, finds itself in this dilemma, that if it distributes at all equitably the full products of efficient machine production, the mode of living which this great wealth makes possible renders men quite unwilling to accept the discipline which most of our present day machine processes require. That really is our dilemma to-day. On the one hand, we are trying to give to all men the kind of leisure and culture which formerly was only possible for the rich and powerful. On the other hand, we are, for the most part, resigning ourselves to supporting that leisure by work processes which only poor and helpless men will ever tolerate. The thing simply does not make sense.

I said before that drudgery, unless accepted as a penance, as our industrial drudgery certainly is not, produces first revolt, and then, if that is successful, licence and debauchery. Does it not follow, that unless we now succeed in organising our work with machinery so that at any rate the normal practice is for machine workers to find some of their reward in their work—is it not clear that unless we do this, we shall sooner or later, and sooner rather than later, have to counter revolt by repression? If you think that I am exaggerating, remember that many people who pride themselves upon being realists are already saying that it is doubtful whether we shall be able to carry on much longer without a little more unemployment.



And once we begin to rely upon that kind of an argument you know where it leads!

I have given you a picture of what I call our Dilemma. Has the Church any guidance to offer? I am sure that it has. But I am equally sure that we its members have not yet succeeded in formulating the message which we ought to be giving. And before we can make our message clear I think we shall have to hark back and rediscover some of the truths by which our ancestors lived.

Instead of our present false and irrational ideas of work and leisure we must go back to the tested concepts of labour and rest, prayer and thanksgiving, creation and recreation, diligence and idleness which ages of Christian thought and striving have clarified for us. Idleness—and much of our hankering after leisure to-day is a mere hankering after idleness—idleness is not a leisured state to be coveted as a reward for hard work. Idleness is a deadly sin. If a healthy man looks around him at any moment, does he not always see more worthwhile work waiting to be done than he can possibly find time or strength to accomplish? And do not the limits of a man's strength, and the fact that his work suffers if he oversteps them, do not these provide a natural call to rest which each one of us gladly obeys, unless with presumption we rate the importance of our own efforts too highly? And does not nature invite us to play as well as to work? Finally, if we but use our eyes do we not see that all sound work is helped by the natural forces which God has set in motion in the world which he has provided for our testing, and therefore, that unless we are self-centred, we are almost impelled to find time for thanksgiving and rejoicing? Once more I assure you that I am not merely indulging in subtle verbal distinction. These old concepts conform to Reality as our modern concepts of WORK and LEISURE certainly do not. And unless we get our theory right our practice can hardly fail to be unprofitable!

If we want our work to be profitable, if we want our leisure to satisfy us, we must go back to the old idea of *Laborare est Orare*. We must insist that it is the Christian duty of the expert planner—and our complicated system will always require experts—it is the Christian duty of the expert to plan processes so that those who are engaged in them may truly



find a sense of vocation in their daily work. And we must insist that it is no less the Christian duty of the individual worker to try to find work which he himself can regard as a vocation or as ministering to someone else who has already found a vocation. This may seem a tall order when we remember the conveyor belt and the dreadful monotony of so many processes now in daily use. But already enough experimental work has been done to establish certain principles which when applied unfailingly take us in the right direction.

*First of all, the principle of Quality.* A man certainly cannot feel that his work has a religious significance if he is making something, or causing something to be made, which he himself would not care to have for his own use or for the use of his friend.

*Secondly, the principle of Fellowship in Work.* A man certainly cannot feel that his work has a religious significance if he is forcing men to work under conditions which he would not choose if he himself were doing the operative job, or if he were asking his own son to do it. Nor can the man who has had bad working conditions imposed upon him feel that he is in fellowship with the man who imposes them.

*Thirdly, the principle of the Just Price.* No man has the absolute right to say what wages he shall have or what profit he shall make. These are matters which always affect the welfare of more than one person and therefore must be looked at from a great many points of view if a just decision is to be arrived at. Moreover the rates which are eventually fixed must always be subject to speedy review if conditions change.

*Fourthly, what is now called the principle of Security.*—It used to be called the principle of private property. Whether a man invests his savings or his working days in an honest trade, justice requires that the rest of us should respect his investment and try to protect it from the results of temporary depressions and other adversities.

I am sure that compared with a generation ago, all these principles are receiving increased attention to-day, and whatever industrial stability we still enjoy is due to the fact that this is so. But too often, and especially when difficulties arise, the very contrary principles of, the cheapest possible job, maximum output per man hour, the highest profit or wage that the market will stand, confiscation of savings or ruthless



sacking of redundant labour—when serious difficulties arise, these very contrary principles are too often applied. And so our sense of frustration increases. Only a Church which believes that God and the individual conscience are the eternal realities, only such a Church is in a position to take the long view. And only such a Church by effectively discharging her teaching responsibilities can create the right atmosphere in which a machine industry can prove a blessing and not a curse.

There are no sound economic or technical reasons why an efficient machine industry should not produce fine quality goods. Have we not already some cigarette lighters and refrigerators and motor cars which are the products of first class craftsmanship? And do not these in the long run use up less labour and raw material for their manufacture and maintenance than repeated supplies of inferior makes? And is there not nearly always “a better feeling” in a Works when quality and not profit is the main goal? Finally is not even the hard-headed employer inclined to hang on to labour that is skilled, and that if dispensed with, would be difficult to recruit or take a long time to re-train? From every sane point of view quality production is a sound proposition!

Of course neither as producer nor as consumer can we enjoy the benefits of quality production if we are unwilling to forego the flashier and more immediate results of scamped jobs. But much of the trumpery and many of the gadgets which our present industrial system produces will not be tolerated when we get our values right. For no sensible man wants to be saddled with possessions unless they really do enrich his life.

I am afraid that some of you may be thinking that having been asked to speak on Leisure I am neglecting my subject and spending too much time thinking around the endlessly complicated subject of work. But I am doing so with a purpose, and for two particular reasons. First of all, as I said before, I am convinced that we can never get our leisure right unless we get our work right. And secondly, I am equally certain that much that we are longing for to-day in what we call our leisure can really only be found in what we now regard as our work. Do we not often say of a good workman whose mastership we envy, that he never gets flustered, in fact that he always seems to go about his work



in a leisurely sort of way? There is such a thing as leisure in work, and it is organically connected with leisure outside work. Let me explain what I mean.

A good craftsman or apprentice does not finish his work the moment he "clocks out." In the street, at home, on the playing fields, or in the theatre, he is constantly experiencing contacts which exercise his mind on his work problems. He may have a binge now and again, but like the traditional housewife, his work is never done! And similarly anyone who has succeeded in finding his true work does not abandon his leisure the moment he enters a factory or workshop. Always there are times when a man who is on top of his job can for example think about his girl, or about Saturday's football, or even perhaps about the last sermon he heard, whilst the work is so to speak doing itself. For instinctively a good workman gives his whole attention to his work when it needs it, and there are not many jobs which require concentrated attention from start to finish. Besides, it really is true that every work-process, no matter how highly mechanised, provides breaks, or can be made to provide breaks, and ought to be made to provide them, which can be used for rest and reflection and thanksgiving. The fact is that, as Dorothy Sayers has so often stressed, we are scamping much of our work to-day because we begrudge it the time which is its due. We are so keen upon getting the last ounce of production that we deny ourselves the leisure which in the nature of things is inherent in every work-process. But Nature has a way of reasserting herself, and so as we try to maintain Full Employment we find that we are being confronted with what the economists call Hidden Unemployment, by which they mean that workers are going slow because, for example, they do not always see a full day's work ahead of them, or that employers themselves are spinning out jobs because they do not want to allow their skilled workers to go to their competitors. I have not the time to attempt an adequate discussion of this particular problem but one aspect of it has a very direct bearing on our subject.

In the nature of things it is not possible for us to estimate our resources and requirements, and organise our production, so that all our machines shall be kept running at full pressure with unfailing regularity. Of course our planners must try to



even-out loads, but in the very nature of things machine production has its seasons. Just as a farmer's year brings rushes of work at lambing time or harvest, after which things may slacken off a bit, so wireless manufacturers normally experience a much increased demand in the autumn, and motor car manufacturers a similar one in the spring. The more skilled our machine processes, and the better they are organised to serve the public, the more pronounced will these seasonal fluctuations become. And they will be found, each with its own particular rhythm, in trades as widely differing as electricity generating, house building, clothing manufacturing and banking! To a certain extent when things are quiet in one trade the spare workers in it ought to lend a hand to their fellows in another and help them whilst they are hard pushed to get through their work. Do not postal workers at Christmas and agricultural workers at harvest already receive such help? And to a certain extent these periodical lulls in an industry ought to be used by individual workers to try out other jobs in the hope of bettering themselves. But by and large the problem remains—what shall a man do during a temporary slackening off in his trade whilst he is waiting for it to revive? Every battalion commander or ship's captain knows that there are times when there is almost nothing for the men to do, and that during these times it is most important that he should keep them together and not let their morale suffer. So it is with industry. We must learn how to keep a good plant idle when for the time being its products are not required. At present we tend to scrap the plant and the workers too if we cannot quickly force open a new market. And this constantly recurring compulsion to capture new markets leads to all sorts of financial and international troubles. Somehow or other we must learn how to make good use of the leisure which a lull in demand has shown to be the workers' due, for apart from anything else, nothing can be more degrading or inefficient than pretending to work and in fact going slow.

The leisure in work which highly mechanised industry inevitably provides ought to be valued for what it is, the time allowed to refresh ourselves, think about our work, and improve our knowledge of our craft. Do we not get a line from the recollection that our very word "School" comes from



the Latin word which comes nearest to what we now call leisure?

By lectures and demonstrations and visits to other works the leisure time in industry ought to be used to raise the cultural level and increase the technical skill and knowledge of all who are engaged in it. Let whatever production is going forward, go forward with its normal speed and swing, and let the time which is freed from production be acknowledged unashamedly and used to the honour and glory of God and of the craft.

What I have just been saying is in accordance with the evidence which our past industrial practice has provided, and can be shown I think by reference to one of those unpleasant truths which economists are so often dubbed "heartless" for pointing out. A slump brought about by over-production, induces a violent competition for survival, out of which new and improved technical processes emerge. Can we not avoid the unpleasant consequences of a slump and yet continue to improve our technical processes? To a large extent I think we can. But only if, first of all, we devise a way of financing this leisure which is in industry (and judging by our modern standards that should not be difficult), and secondly only to the extent that we all make up our minds that the time when demand is quiet shall be used by everyone in Industry to review old methods and processes, and devise new and better ways of doing things.

Whenever time can be spared from production, the opportunity presents itself to each individual to take stock of what he has been doing and to see if by any chance he can do it better in future. Looked at in this light our present "Hidden Unemployment" presents us with a splendid opportunity. Apprentice, machine worker and charge hand should be asked to say what it was about their old work which satisfied them and what it was that they found had simply to be endured. And they should be invited to make their own suggestions for improving matters. Of course their partners in industry, the technicians, designers and salesmen, must do the same. Each from his own particular angle should be invited to put forward suggestions for improving his own particular job. As a matter of fact, whenever trade has to be



revived, these important persons generally do make suggestions, but their views however objective must always be sectional views. And no one section in industry can possibly interpret all the aspirations and aptitudes which are the real motive power behind industry.

Get a true picture of these promptings and desires and the question of who shall do the dirty work immediately becomes more tractable. The old work of the crossing sweeper and the navvy is now done by power-driven machines in the handling and servicing of which real skill is demanded. The job which merely requires monotonous lever pulling can itself be done by machinery which because of its ingenuity will demand for its maintenance the attention of a whole man. Of course new drudgeries will appear as fast as we get rid of the old ones, but these new drudgeries must be attacked with all the good will and technical ingenuity we can muster. On the one hand, Christians must point out that drudgery is a form of pain, and that the traditional attitude of the Church to pain which is unavoidable, is that it is sent as a mortification—it provides the opportunity for a spiritual exercise which may be the means of bringing good out of evil. On the other hand, Christians and humanists must insist that the drudgery which cannot yet be eliminated must be shared, and above all, that a limit must be placed to the period of any one individual's drudgery. The practical observer will of course note that for a limited period repetitive work can help an apprentice to get precision and speed.

As our inventors present us with new machinery and as our personal spending calls for a better quality of output, we shall find that the positive attractions of work will begin to reassert themselves and that men will begin to look for some of their leisure in their work. But even work which calls to a man may prove a curse unless the call is from the right direction. The principles I have spoken about must be applied by men who are constantly being reminded by the Church that Vocation is a fact and not merely a picturesque theory which our quaint forefathers used to hold.

If we can get our leisure in work right, then our leisure out of work will tend to take care of itself. For a man who knows how to work knows how to make for himself the conditions



he requires for his recreations and hobbies. He may want a little guidance at times, but probe deep enough and he knows instinctively which game is his game and what particular study it is that he wishes to pursue. If his work does not provide him with enough adventure and hazard he will seek an outlet for this side of his nature in the sport he chooses. Is not the present craze for gambling the result of working conditions which provide too few occasions for the unexpected to happen? And do not men who are forced to be excessively co-operative in their work choose games which are perhaps excessively competitive? You may provide facilities for games and recreations and studies, but you cannot make sure that this or that individual person will partake of the fare you have provided for him. This is because even when you are dealing with a man's leisure you are dealing with the whole man, for whom no pursuit retains its hold for long unless at one and the same time it satisfies him on more than one of the levels on which his life is lived. The child's jig-saw puzzle for example, besides providing for the exercise of its visual and manual dexterity, also exercises its faith, for has not the child already seen the completed picture and therefore knows that the job can be done? Faith and Industry are rewarded as the picture which was formerly only in the mind's eye takes concrete form in the finished jig-saw. And just as the instructional element in leisure leads up to theological instruction, so the spontaneous play element leads to ritual. Does not even a Low Churchman become a ritualist when he captains his village cricket team?

As I lay down my discourse I am irresistibly reminded of the old *Punch* joke about the fisherman. Most of you will have heard it before. "The only time a fisherman ever tells the truth is when he calls another fisherman a liar." I am reminded of this because as I look back I seem to have been more successful in exposing the lie which is called leisure to-day, than I have been in pointing out what true leisure really is. If this be so, and I think it is, my excuse is that as yet there does not exist anything which might truly be called a Christian doctrine of leisure. The word itself only occurs once in the Bible. No hymn has been written to accompany a sermon on leisure. And yet there is something in our modern concept of leisure which springs from the promptings



of religion. The trouble is that these promptings have been allowed to express themselves without the help and guidance which reference to theology affords. Our modern idea of leisure might indeed be said to be "out of pagan 18th century culture, by 20th century democracy." If in closing, I may hazard an opinion I should say that when we do formulate a Christian doctrine of leisure it will be something on these lines—that for the Christian the ultimate truth about Man's leisure on earth is that it is the time allowed—that is the root meaning of the word—it is the time allowed in the midst of our daily work and play, the time allowed to walk the earth and commune with God as we contemplate the beauties of his universe and meditate upon first and last things. Man's true leisure is indeed inseparable from the practice of the presence of God.

Issued by the INDUSTRIAL CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP,

1, Broadway, Westminster, S.W. 1.

No. 164.



# INDUSTRIAL CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP

(With which is incorporated The Christian Social Union)

---

*Presidents :*

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

THE ARCHBISHOP OF WALES

THE PRIMUS OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

THE ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH

THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN

*Vice-President :*

THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

*Chairman :*

THE BISHOP OF CHESTER

*Hon. Treasurers :*

REV. CANON NORMAN HOOK

JOHN RYAN, ESQ., C.B.E.

*General Director :*

THE REV. PREB. P. T. R. KIRK

---

The work of the Fellowship is evangelistic. There are many ways in which the work of converting both the individual and society is carried out. One of the most important is by lay Missioners, who have to undergo a course of training in social science, theology and public speaking: and, as long as they are on the staff of the I.C.F., they are obliged to study, to keep up to date in the subjects with which they are dealing.

Another aspect of the work was formerly carried out by the Christian Social Union, which sought to bring home to the more fortunate their obligation as Christians for the social order in which they live. This is done in large measure by the Area Directors, priests and laymen, each responsible for conveying the message in the dioceses in which he works, by preaching, addressing meetings, by taking part in conferences, and by talks to groups of business men and industrialists. And, however differently it may



be worded, the message that Christ is the Lord of all life never varies.

One of the worst enemies of progress is ignorance. Study groups are stimulated throughout the country. The Fellowship has a large variety of pamphlets on social and religious subjects, and these are continually being added to. The most important educational undertaking that the I.C.F. has ever conceived is now becoming a practical question. A house (Thedden Grange, Alton, Hants.), has been given by a business man for use as a Training College for Missioners, to which clergy will be able to go for refresher courses in social theology, and which will serve as a conference centre.

To maintain our work, new Annual Subscriptions are urgently needed. Our present income is totally inadequate to support our Missioners and Directors, organize Crusades, develop our Research Work, promote Study Groups, maintain the Training College, and publish Literature of a high standard, giving the Church's message on social, industrial and economic questions.

WILL YOU HELP US TO INCREASE OUR ACTIVITIES, and make them more effective, by sending an Annual Subscription or Donation?

## Form of Contribution

To HON. TREASURERS,

THE INDUSTRIAL CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP,

~~THE VICARAGE, 1, BROADWAY,~~

~~WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1.~~

195, NEW KENT ROAD, LONDON, S.E.1.

Date.....

I enclose a Subscription of £ : s. d. in  
Donation  
 response to your appeal.

Name.....  
 (Block letters)

Address.....

Cheques should be drawn in favour of the Industrial Christian Fellowship and crossed "Williams Deacon's Bank, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W. 1."

H. B. Skinner & Co., Ltd., S.E. 5.